COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

<u>L.R. No.</u>: 0947-01 <u>Bill No.</u>: HB 324

Subject: Agriculture and Animals; Crimes and Punishment

<u>Type</u>: Original

Date: February 6, 2001

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON STATE FUNDS							
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004				
General Revenue Fund	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)				
Total Estimated Net Effect on All State Funds	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)				

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS						
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004			
None						
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0			

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS						
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004			
Local Government	\$0	\$0	\$0			

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 4 pages.

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials from the **Office of State Courts Administrator**, **Office of Attorney General**, and the **Department of Agriculture** assume the proposed legislation would have no fiscal impact on their agencies.

Officials from the **Office of Prosecution Services** assume prosecutors can absorb the cost of the proposed legislation with existing resources.

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** cannot currently predict the number of new commitments which may result from the creation of the offense(s) outlined in this proposal. An increase in commitments depends on the utilization by prosecutors and the actual sentences imposed by the court. If additional persons are sentenced to the custody of the DOC due to the provisions of this legislation, the DOC will incur a corresponding increase in operational costs either through incarceration (FY99 average of \$35.61 per inmate, per day) or through supervision provided by the Board of Probation and Parole (FY99 average of \$2.47 per offender, per day).

The following factors contribute to DOC's minimal assumption:

- DOC assumes the narrow scope of the crime will not encompass a large number of offenders;
- The low felony status of the crime enhances the possibility of plea-bargaining or imposition of a probation sentence.

Supervision by the DOC through probation or incarceration would result in some additional costs, but it is assumed that the impact would be \$0 or a minimal amount that could be absorbed within existing resources.

The need for additional capital improvements is not anticipated at this time. It must be noted that the cumulative effect of various new legislation, if adopted, could result in the need for additional capital improvements funding if the total number of new offenders exceeds current planned capacity.

Oversight assumes that the conviction and incarceration of only one person would create a minimal fiscal impact of less than \$100,000 annually.

Officials from the **Office of State Public Defender** assume existing staff could provide representation for those 5-10 cases arising where indigent persons were charged with the new crime of engaging in sexual conduct with an animal. However passage of more than one similar bill would require the State Public Defender System to request increased appropriations to cover ASSUMPTION (continued)

BLG:LR:OD (12/00)

L.R. No. 0947-01 Bill No. HB 324 Page 3 of 4 February 6, 2001

the cumulative cost of representing the indigent accused in these cases where the penalty has been enhanced.

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2002 (10 Mo.)	FY 2003	FY 2004
GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
Cost - Department of Corrections Incarceration/Probation Costs	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND	(Less than <u>\$100,000)</u>	(Less than <u>\$100,000)</u>	(Less than <u>\$100,000)</u>
FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government	FY 2002 (10 Mo.)	FY 2003	FY 2004

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

No direct fiscal impact to small businesses would be expected as a result of this proposal.

DESCRIPTION

The proposed legislation makes it a class D felony to knowingly engage in sexual conduct with an animal, or knowingly cause another to engage in sexual conduct with an animal for sexual gratification.

In addition, this proposal contains provisions for the court to prohibit the defendant from harboring animals, order the defendant to forfeit all animals residing in the defendant's household, and order the defendant to receive a psychological evaluation and counseling.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

BLG:LR:OD (12/00)

L.R. No. 0947-01 Bill No. HB 324 Page 4 of 4 February 6, 2001

Office of State Courts Administrator Office of Prosecution Services Office of the State Public Defender Department of Agriculture Office of Attorney General Department of Corrections

Jeanne Jarrett, CPA

Director

February 6, 2001